

RANDOLPH COUNTY JOURNAL.

DIGGS & DYNES,

"IF THERE ARE ANY IN THIS COUNTRY WHO WOULD RISE, I SAY TO THEM, IN GOD'S NAME, GOOD SPEED."—WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

PROPRIETORS.

NEW SERIES.—VOL. 4.

WINCHESTER, RANDOLPH COUNTY, INDIANA: THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1861.

NO. 6.—WHOLE NO. 266.

Randolph Co. Journal

IS PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY MORNING BY

DIGGS & DYNES,

OFFICE ON MAIN STREET, WINCHESTER, IND.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

One copy, one year, One Dollar and Fifty Cents.

IN ADVANCE.

No paper discontinued until arrears are paid.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

One square, first insertion, 15 cents.

Each subsequent insertion, 10 cents.

One column, one year, \$1.00.

Half column, one year, 50 cents.

Quarter column, one year, 25 cents.

Advertisements, to secure insertion the same week, must be handed in by Tuesday morning.

Legal advertisements must be paid for in advance.

Advertisements will be published until ordered out and charged for accordingly.

No type larger than Two Line Nonpareil or Cate will be inserted in advertisements, except at double the usual rates for the whole advertisement.

PLAIN AND ORNAMENTAL PRINTING,

in a style unsurpassed in the West.

SATISFACTION GUARANTEED.

FIRST PREMIUM FOR PRINTING AWARDED AT THE RANDOLPH COUNTY FAIR, OCT. 1860.

All communications or anything in connection with the office should be addressed to

DIGGS & DYNES,

WINCHESTER, IND.

Business Directory.

ATTORNEYS.

BROWN & CHENEY,

Attorneys at Law,

WINCHESTER, INDIANA.

Office in the new Jail Building.

Give especial attention to the security and collection of claims.

GOODE & WATSON,

Attorneys and Counselors at Law,

WINCHESTER, INDIANA.

Office upstairs in the new Jail Building.

Will promptly attend to all business entrusted to their care. Representation given to the securing and collection of claims.

PELLE & NEFF,

Attorneys and Counselors at Law,

WINCHESTER, INDIANA.

Office in the new Jail Building.

Will practice in the Circuit and Common Pleas Courts, the Supreme Court, and the U. S. Court for the District of Indiana. Special attention given to the collection of claims.

SILAS COLGROVE,

Attorney and Counselor at Law,

EAST PUBLIC SQUARE, WINCHESTER, IND.

Will promptly and diligently attend to all business entrusted to his care.

CAREY S. GOODRICH,

Attorney and Counselor at Law,

FIRST FLOOR NEW JAIL BUILDING, WINCHESTER, IND.

Will promptly attend to all business entrusted to his care. Special attention given to the securing and collection of claims.

ANDREW J. NEFF,

Notary Public,

Will take depositions, acknowledge deeds, mortgages, powers of attorney, etc., in Winchester, Ind.

DR. D. FERGUSON,

Physician and Surgeon,

Office at his old stand, on Main and South Sts., Winchester, Ind.

Where he may at all times be found unless professionally engaged.

DR. J. E. BEVERLY,

Physician and Surgeon,

WINCHESTER, INDIANA.

Office and residence in Brick Building, corner of North and East streets.

DR. R. W. HAMILTON,

Physician and Surgeon,

WINCHESTER, INDIANA.

Residence on Meridian Street, south of Parkway, office two doors north of the Journal office, upstairs.

DR. G. W. BRUCE,

Physician and Surgeon,

WINCHESTER, INDIANA.

He may at all times be found at his office on Washington Street, unless professionally engaged.

A. F. TEAL, M. D.,

Physician and Surgeon,

WINCHESTER, INDIANA.

Office on Franklin Street, one door west of Post office. He may always be found at his office or residence unless professionally engaged.

DR. H. W. FOSDICK,

Dentist and Dispensary,

WINCHESTER, INDIANA.

Rooms two doors north of Journal office, upstairs. All work in either line of business, warranted to give satisfaction. Patronage solicited.

MERCHANTS.

E. J. PUTMAN,

Wholesale and Retail Dealer in

STAPLE AND FANCY DRY GOODS,

Groceries, Hats, Caps, Boots and Shoes.

Also deals in all kinds of Grain.

Store in the Brick Warehouse, Winchester, Indiana.

W. B. PIERCE,

DRUGGIST,

and dealer in

BOOKS AND STATIONERY.

East of the Public Square, under Journal office.

JOHN ROSS,

dealer in

GROCERIES AND PROVISIONS,

N. E. cor. Main and Franklin Sts., Winchester, Ind.

GEORGE M. ADAMS,

Tin, Copper, and Sheet Iron Worker,

Shop West of Public Square,

WINCHESTER, INDIANA.

Stoves, etc., kept constantly on hand.

JOHN RICHARDSON,

Merchant Tailor,

WINCHESTER, INDIANA.

Shop west of the Public Square, on Meridian St.

Blanks, all kinds, for sale at this office.

Love.

BY J. R. LOWELL.

Love steals into the heart
With feet as silent as the lightning dawn
That kisses smooth the rough brow of the dark.
And hath its will through blissful gentleness—
Not like a rocket, which, with savage glare,
While suddenly up, then bursts, and leaves the night.
Painfully quivering on the dazzled eyes:
A love that gives and takes, that seeth faults,
Not with slow seeking eyes like needle-points,
But, loving kindly, ever looks them down
With the o'ercoming faith of meek forgiveness;
A love that shall be new and fresh each hour.
As the golden mystery of sunset, and
Of the sweet coming of the evening star,
Alike, and yet most unlike, every day.
And seeming ever best and fairest now;
A love that doth not know for what it seeks,
But faces Truth and Beauty as their peer,
Showing its worthiness of noble thoughts
By a clear sense of inward nobleness;
A love that in its object finds not
All grace and beauty, and enough to save
Its thirst of blessing, but, in all of good
Finds there, it sees but heaven-granted types
Of good and beauty in the soul of man.
And traces, in the simplest heart that beats,
A family likeness to the chosen one.
That claims of it the rights of brotherhood.
For Love is blind but with the dearest eye.
Behind the unperceived, most honest jump of clay,
With arms outstretched and eager face ablaze,
Yearning but to be understood and loved.

A Voice From the Loyal South.

BY O. W. HOLMES.

We sing "Our Country" song to night,
With added voice and eye;
Her banner drops in clouded light
Beneath the wintry sky.
We'll pledge her once in golden wine
Before her stars have set;
Though dim one reddening orb may shine,
We have a Country yet.

'T were vain to sigh o'er errors past,
The fault of sires or sons;
Our soldier heard the threatening blast,
And spied his useless gun;
He saw the star-wreathed ensign fall,
By mad invaders torn;
But saw it from the bastioned wall,
That laughed their rage to scorn.

What though their angry cry be flung
Across the howling wave,
They smite the air with little tongue
The gathering storm who brave;
Enough of speech! the trumpet rings;
Be silent, patient, calm—
God help them! if the tempest swings
The flag against the palm!

Our tolling years have made us tame;
Our strength has slept unlit;
The furnace fire is slow to flame
That bids our ploughshares melt;
'T is hard to lose the bread to win
In spite of Nature's doom—
To tread the iron threads we spin
That weave our webs of doom!

To see the rustling turbans stand
Before the captives' flames,
To fold the arms that flood the land
With rivers from their looms;
But hear still with Northmen's scorn
The Truth forgot so long;
When once their slumbering passions burn,
The peaceful are the strong!

The Lord have mercy on the weak,
And calm their frenzied ire;
And save our brethren ere the shriek
Of "We play with Northmen's fire!"
The eagle hold his mountain light—
The tiger pace his den!
Give all their country, each his right!
God keep us all! Amen!

NATIONAL FAY, Jan. 4, 1861.

Rough Beginning of the Honeymoon.

On last Friday morning, an athletic young farmer in the town of Waynesburg, took a fair girl, "all bathed in blushes," from her parents, and started for the first town, across the Pennsylvania line, to be married, where the ceremony could be performed without a license. The happy pair were accompanied by a sister of the girl, a tall, gaunt, sharp-featured female of some thirty-seven summers. The pair crossed the line, were married, and returned to Wellsville to pass the night. People at the hotel where the wedding party stopped, observed that they conducted themselves in a rather singular manner. The husband would take his sister-in-law, the tall female aforesaid, into one corner of the parlor and talk earnestly to her, gestulating wildly the while. Then the tall female would "put her foot down" and talk to him in an angry and excited manner. Then the husband would take his fair young bride into a corner, but he could no sooner commence talking to her than the gaunt sister would rush in between them and angrily join in the conversation. The people at the hotel, ascertained what this meant about 9 o'clock that evening. There was an upset in the room which had been assigned to the newly married couple. Female shrieks and masculine "swears" startled the people at the hotel, and they rushed to the spot. The gaunt female was passing and kicking against the door of the room, and the newly-married man, mostly undressed, was barring her out with all his might. Occasionally she would kick the door far enough open to disclose the stalwart husband in his gentleman Greek Slave apparel.

It appeared that the tall female insisted upon occupying the same room with the newly-wedded pair, that her sister was favorably disposed to the arrangement, and that the husband had agreed to it before the wedding took place, and was now indignantly repudiating the contract.

"Won't you go away, now, Susan, peacefully," said the newly-married man, softening his voice.

"No," said she, "I won't—so there."

"Don't you budge an inch!" cried the married sister within the room.

"Now, now, Maria," said the young man to his wife, in piteous tone, "don't go to cutting up in this way; now don't."

"I'll cut up as much as I want!" she sharply replied.

"Well," roared the desperate man, throwing the door wide open and stalking out among the crowd

"well, just you two women put on your gowns and bring back the old women, and your grand-father, who is now to a hundred; bring 'em all here, and I'll marry the whole of 'em and a score of 'em, and we'll all sleep together!"

The difficulty was finally adjusted by the tall female taking a room alone. Wellsville is enjoying itself over the sensation.—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

THE PRINTER.—This fine manual for the craft, for December is received. Published by Henry & Greason, N. Y., at \$1 a year.

STATE OF THE NATION.

SPEECH OF

Hon. Thomas Corwin, of Ohio.

On Monday, Jan. 21st, the Hon. Thomas Corwin, of Ohio, made a speech on the report of the committee of thirty-three, of which we have the following report:

Mr. Corwin (Rep., Ohio.) Chairman of the committee of thirty-three, brought up his report, and proceeded to address the House, he said: It was not his intention to occupy the time of the House at any great length. He was there to discharge the duty which devolved upon him as one of the committee of thirty-three, and to present to his colleagues the motives which had induced the committee to come to the result they had. It is now thirty-three years since he had taken his seat on that floor.

Two years after that time, he was called upon, in his representative character, on a subject very nearly akin, if not identical to that which now unhappily distracted the public mind from one end of this distracted republic to the other.

At that time a portion of the Southern people, led on by the State of South Carolina, had declared, in a convention of her people, that a certain act of Congress, known as the general law for the collection of the revenue in the shape of imports on foreign merchandise, was unconstitutional, and upon that the State determined to absolve herself from all her constitutional obligations, and had endeavored to "secede" from the Union. That, he believed, was not the word then employed to characterize the action of a State intending to withdraw. The cause which had impelled the State of South Carolina to withdraw from the Union at that time was sympathized in by so-called Southern States, though it was not the same as was now alleged as the cause of the present distraction in our national affairs. South Carolina then determined for herself, as the purport was announced, the act of taxing duties on foreign merchandise was unconstitutional, and its nature and tendency oppressive to the people. South Carolina announced that under this belief she would withdraw herself from the Union, and establish an independent Republic of her own. The doctrine now asserted in several parts of the Union, and as carried out by South Carolina was that an unconstitutional act passed by the Legislature of a State, was of itself sufficient ground of withdrawal from the Union, if any State should choose to consider that unconstitutional law as a breach of the compact which bound it to the Federal Union.

When these unhappy differences, which so much distracted the public mind from 1831 to 1833 were at last settled and composed, he little dreamed that the termination of his natural life, and still nearer approaching the close of his public life, he should be again called upon to act in a matter so closely connected in character with that other act to which he had referred. He believed, however, that history, in every age, since the first occupation of the globe by man to this hour, evinced that where a great deal of liberty existed, where the blessings of liberty were most enjoyed, that the social combination was always in danger of being disturbed by the licentious conduct of some party organization.

It might have been supposed that at some period of the history of this confederated republic, there would be a tendency to fall off from the center of attraction, and eventually, if not speedily, there would be an agitation among some of the States of the Union, and from causes connected therewith, we might expect some day or other, attempted dissolution of the bonds which hold us together as a nation. That was the very question that they were now called upon to consider, as well as the nature of the means by which the evils so dreaded were to be averted.

In considering the question whether the Government had any legislative power, as it was supposed it had, to coerce a portion of the great national combination to obey the laws of the Government of the United States, he would, so far as he could, look into the matter as a question of constitutional law.

He thought gentlemen on both sides had misunderstood the facts bearing on the question, and the meaning of the word coercion as applied to the Government. Again, they were mistaken in the supposition that all the laws that might be considered fatal to the existence of the Republic of the United States, as now constituted, might not be enforced without any attempt whatever at coercion any State taking this or that position. If it were true that a State might withdraw itself from all connection with its fellow States of the Union, it did not follow that if a State did choose to avail itself of the benefits conferred by the Union and the laws, that each law vital to the existence of the Union may not be enforced without disturbing the peace of that State; that is, if a State ever did withdraw, all the laws might be enforced without disturbing her political relations to the general Union; and if a State should secede, whether it did so under the specious garb of State sovereignty or not, he was unable to see how it was that any distinct number of men, combined to give force and countenance to the existence of the laws of the United States, could pass laws to make any difference in the measure of the offense, if it be an offense, denominated treason. The facts which had come to his knowledge of the course taken had been fully submitted to the committee. Now it was supposed that the causes of the complaint which had led to this strange and eccentric movement of the Southern States, either had no foundation in fact, or if they had these causes of complaint could be removed, and the people might hope that the public tranquillity would be restored. That brought him to the consideration of one or two topics which he would briefly present. They were compelled, in matters of this kind, to resort to every species of information, not, perhaps, always accurate, but the best that they could command. It had been alleged that unconstitutional laws had been passed by several of the States, which laws had a tendency to embarrass the operation of the constitutional laws of the United States, and that these acts were, in the judgment of the Southern States, sufficient cause for dissolving their connection with the Union. These laws had acquired the name of "Personal Liberty Bills." In some of the States, and here they would find that they were placed exactly in the predicament and position of a legal judgment, as they were in 1833, to determine with reference to the laws of the United States. It was then alleged that unconstitutional laws had been passed by the Government, which had a prejudicial tendency, and that such being the case, that was in itself sufficient reason for the secession of a State passed a law unconstitutional

in character, was the proper judicature to determine the character of that law placed in a sovereign State? If it were so, a State would have the right to absolve itself from all allegiance, and absolve its citizens from all allegiance to the Government of the United States.

Undoubtedly if this was the case, if this was sufficient cause for breaking up the Union, they might have a thousand reasons, seized on with much propriety, for breaking up and dissolving the Union as now. The judicial reports of the courts all over the country were full of decisions which had declared that such and such a law was unconstitutional, and that such and such a law was null and void. It was for the purpose of having a tribunal for settling forever all disputed points of constitutionality, where these questions, as a last appeal, should be decided, that the Supreme Court of the United States was established. It had been established to protect the rights of all the States against encroachments, no matter from what quarter they might come. To this last arbitrament it had been the habit of the peace and liberty-loving people of the country to refer all their disputes and differences, and hitherto the Supreme Court had decided all questions of constitutional law submitted to it. Now the Supreme Court was the proper arbiter of this very question. This unconstitutional law, to which he had adverted, was a law enacted by some of the States for the purpose of protecting the free people of these States from the possibility of danger arising from the manner in which the laws of Congress touching the recapture of fugitive slaves was executed within their limits. On this point he might say he himself did not approve of these laws; but yet it was not for him to arraign the legislatures of sovereign States in any attempt they might make to preserve what they deemed the just rights of the people within their separate jurisdictions. But it was obvious to any man of the commonest understanding that any such laws, though they might exist in the statute books of a State, were yet totally null and void when they came in conflict with the laws of the United States. He was looking at this allegation as one which, if it could in any way be sustained by fact, could be easily removed; or, rather, he now wished to show that it could not have any effect on the interests or rights of Southern men or Southern States.

The law for the recapture and surrender of fugitive slaves was passed in 1850, and was sustained by the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the State courts had no more to do with it than they had with the act of 1793. It must follow, as a legal consequence inevitable, that the Supreme Court of the United States, if it deemed the law of 1850, or the law of 1793 as amended by that of 1850, as within the Constitution and province of Congress, it follows that they will execute that law; and therefore every law coming in contact with any portion of the constitutional law, and interfering to its execution, must be deemed by them totally void, and of no effect. When he asserted this he presumed that no man, whether a lawyer or a layman, would disagree with him.

If, then, any of those laws passed in the North entered into conflict with the laws of the United States, which were declared to be unconstitutional by the courts of the Federal Government, that Constitution under which they still lived and which was the paramount law of the land, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are all treaties made under it, should be the Supreme law of the land, anything in the laws and constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. The committee, therefore, had been anxious to find out what injury had resulted to citizens or their property from these laws. That brought him to the question of property. He looked upon that as property which, owing a man labor, could be converted into value in goods or money. That he called property. He did not mean to say that man had property in man, but there was a relationship existing between a slave and his owner which was recognized by the Constitution, which was declared to be unconstitutional by the courts of the Federal Government, that Constitution under which they still lived and which was the paramount law of the land, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are all treaties made under it, should be the Supreme law of the land, anything in the laws and constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. The committee, therefore, had been anxious to find out what injury had resulted to citizens or their property from these laws. That brought him to the question of property. He looked upon that as property which, owing a man labor, could be converted into value in goods or money. That he called property. He did not mean to say that man had property in man, but there was a relationship existing between a slave and his owner which was recognized by the Constitution, which was declared to be unconstitutional by the courts of the Federal Government, that Constitution under which they still lived and which was the paramount law of the land, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are all treaties made under it, should be the Supreme law of the land, anything in the laws and constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. The committee, therefore, had been anxious to find out what injury had resulted to citizens or their property from these laws. That brought him to the question of property. He looked upon that as property which, owing a man labor, could be converted into value in goods or money. That he called property. He did not mean to say that man had property in man, but there was a relationship existing between a slave and his owner which was recognized by the Constitution, which was declared to be unconstitutional by the courts of the Federal Government, that Constitution under which they still lived and which was the paramount law of the land, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are all treaties made under it, should be the Supreme law of the land, anything in the laws and constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. The committee, therefore, had been anxious to find out what injury had resulted to citizens or their property from these laws. That brought him to the question of property. He looked upon that as property which, owing a man labor, could be converted into value in goods or money. That he called property. He did not mean to say that man had property in man, but there was a relationship existing between a slave and his owner which was recognized by the Constitution, which was declared to be unconstitutional by the courts of the Federal Government, that Constitution under which they still lived and which was the paramount law of the land, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are all treaties made under it, should be the Supreme law of the land, anything in the laws and constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. The committee, therefore, had been anxious to find out what injury had resulted to citizens or their property from these laws. That brought him to the question of property. He looked upon that as property which, owing a man labor, could be converted into value in goods or money. That he called property. He did not mean to say that man had property in man, but there was a relationship existing between a slave and his owner which was recognized by the Constitution, which was declared to be unconstitutional by the courts of the Federal Government, that Constitution under which they still lived and which was the paramount law of the land, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are all treaties made under it, should be the Supreme law of the land, anything in the laws and constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. The committee, therefore, had been anxious to find out what injury had resulted to citizens or their property from these laws. That brought him to the question of property. He looked upon that as property which, owing a man labor, could be converted into value in goods or money. That he called property. He did not mean to say that man had property in man, but there was a relationship existing between a slave and his owner which was recognized by the Constitution, which was declared to be unconstitutional by the courts of the Federal Government, that Constitution under which they still lived and which was the paramount law of the land, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are all treaties made under it, should be the Supreme law of the land, anything in the laws and constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. The committee, therefore, had been anxious to find out what injury had resulted to citizens or their property from these laws. That brought him to the question of property. He looked upon that as property which, owing a man labor, could be converted into value in goods or money. That he called property. He did not mean to say that man had property in man, but there was a relationship existing between a slave and his owner which was recognized by the Constitution, which was declared to be unconstitutional by the courts of the Federal Government, that Constitution under which they still lived and which was the paramount law of the land, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are all treaties made under it, should be the Supreme law of the land, anything in the laws and constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. The committee, therefore, had been anxious to find out what injury had resulted to citizens or their property from these laws. That brought him to the question of property. He looked upon that as property which, owing a man labor, could be converted into value in goods or money. That he called property. He did not mean to say that man had property in man, but there was a relationship existing between a slave and his owner which was recognized by the Constitution, which was declared to be unconstitutional by the courts of the Federal Government, that Constitution under which they still lived and which was the paramount law of the land, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are all treaties made under it, should be the Supreme law of the land, anything in the laws and constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. The committee, therefore, had been anxious to find out what injury had resulted to citizens or their property from these laws. That brought him to the question of property. He looked upon that as property which, owing a man labor, could be converted into value in goods or money. That he called property. He did not mean to say that man had property in man, but there was a relationship existing between a slave and his owner which was recognized by the Constitution, which was declared to be unconstitutional by the courts of the Federal Government, that Constitution under which they still lived and which was the paramount law of the land, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are all treaties made under it, should be the Supreme law of the land, anything in the laws and constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. The committee, therefore, had been anxious to find out what injury had resulted to citizens or their property from these laws. That brought him to the question of property. He looked upon that as property which, owing a man labor, could be converted into value in goods or money. That he called property. He did not mean to say that man had property in man, but there was a relationship existing between a slave and his owner which was recognized by the Constitution, which was declared to be unconstitutional by the courts of the Federal Government, that Constitution under which they still lived and which was the paramount law of the land, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are all treaties made under it, should be the Supreme law of the land, anything in the laws and constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. The committee, therefore, had been anxious to find out what injury had resulted to citizens or their property from these laws. That brought him to the question of property. He looked upon that as property which, owing a man labor, could be converted into value in goods or money. That he called property. He did not mean to say that man had property in man, but there was a relationship existing between a slave and his owner which was recognized by the Constitution, which was declared to be unconstitutional by the courts of the Federal Government, that Constitution under which they still lived and which was the paramount law of the land, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are all treaties made under it, should be the Supreme law of the land, anything in the laws and constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. The committee, therefore, had been anxious to find out what injury had resulted to citizens or their property from these laws. That brought him to the question of property. He looked upon that as property which, owing a man labor, could be converted into value in goods or money. That he called property. He did not mean to say that man had property in man, but there was a relationship existing between a slave and his owner which was recognized by the Constitution, which was declared to be unconstitutional by the courts of the Federal Government, that Constitution under which they still lived and which was the paramount law of the land, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are all treaties made under it, should be the Supreme law of the land, anything in the laws and constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. The committee, therefore, had been anxious to find out what injury had resulted to citizens or their property from these laws. That brought him to the question of property. He looked upon that as property which, owing a man labor, could be converted into value in goods or money. That he called property. He did not mean to say that man had property in man, but there was a relationship existing between a slave and his owner which was recognized by the Constitution, which was declared to be unconstitutional by the courts of the Federal Government, that Constitution under which they still lived and which was the paramount law of the land, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are all treaties made under it, should be the Supreme law of the land, anything in the laws and constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. The committee, therefore, had been anxious to find out what injury had resulted to citizens or their property from these laws. That brought him to the question of property. He looked upon that as property which, owing a man labor, could be converted into value in goods or money. That he called property. He did not mean to say that man had property in man, but there was a relationship existing between a slave and his owner which was recognized by the Constitution, which was declared to be unconstitutional by the courts of the Federal Government, that Constitution under which they still lived and which was the paramount law of the land, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are all treaties made under it, should be the Supreme law of the land, anything in the laws and constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. The committee, therefore, had been anxious to find out what injury had resulted to citizens or their property from these laws. That brought him to the question of property. He looked upon that as property which, owing a man labor, could be converted into value in goods or money. That he called property. He did not mean to say that man had property in man, but there was a relationship existing between a slave and his owner which was recognized by the Constitution, which was declared to be unconstitutional by the courts of the Federal Government, that Constitution under which they still lived and which was the paramount law of the land, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are all treaties made under it, should be the Supreme law of the land, anything in the laws and constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. The committee, therefore, had been anxious to find out what injury had resulted to citizens or their property from these laws. That brought him to the question of property. He looked upon that as property which, owing a man labor, could be converted into value in goods or money. That he called property. He did not mean to say that man had property in man, but there was a relationship existing between a slave and his owner which was recognized by the Constitution, which was declared to be unconstitutional by the courts of the Federal Government, that Constitution under which they still lived and which was the paramount law of the land, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are all treaties made under it, should be the Supreme law of the land, anything in the laws and constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. The committee, therefore, had been anxious to find out what injury had resulted to citizens or their property from these laws. That brought him to the question of property. He looked upon that as property which, owing a man labor, could be converted into value in goods or money. That he called property. He did not mean to say that man had property in man, but there was a relationship existing between a slave and his owner which was recognized by the Constitution, which was declared to be unconstitutional by the courts of the Federal Government, that Constitution under which they still lived and which was the paramount law of the land, and the laws made in pursuance thereof, are all treaties made under it, should be the Supreme law of the land, anything in the laws and constitution of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. The committee, therefore, had been anxious to find out what injury had resulted to citizens or their property from these laws. That brought him to the question of property. He looked upon that as property which, owing a man labor, could be converted into value in goods or money. That he called property. He did not mean to say that man had property in man, but there was a relationship existing between a slave and his owner which was recognized by the Constitution, which was declared to be unconstitutional by the courts of the Federal Government, that Constitution under which they still lived and